



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/712,641

11/12/2003

Edward O. Clapper

42P18007

8972

59796

7590

11/25/2008

INTEL CORPORATION  
c/o INTELLEVATE, LLC  
P.O. BOX 52050  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

WALSH, JOHN B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2451

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/25/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                                      |   |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/712,641 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>CLAPPER, EDWARD O. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>John B. Walsh     | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2451                   |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 17-42, 44, 45 and 47-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 3-11, 26-34, 39-42, 44 and 45 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 12-14, 17-21, 23-25, 35-38, 47, 48 and 51-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 49 and 50 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2451

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 22 has been amended to recite “dynamically”.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 12-14, 17-21, 23-25, 35-38, 47, 48 and 51-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0006621 to Bellinson et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0124252 to Schaefer et al.

Bellinson et al. '621 discloses:

As concerns claims 1, 23, 24, 47 and 55, a method for monitoring Internet browsing: receiving a URL (universal resource locator) request (abstract lines 6-8) from a first computer (180,202); comparing the URL request with URL entries in an approved table (abstract lines 11-12; 0009) of information; if the requested URL is found in the approved table of information, permitting access of the URL request by the first computer (0010); if the requested URL is not found in the approved table of information, enabling an operator of a second computer (0036-server hardware) determine whether to grant access of the requested URL to the first computer

Art Unit: 2451

(0010; 0036, 212,214); gatekeeper is a module on the second computer (inherent to have a network interface for second computer).

As concerns claims 2, 25 and 48, wherein the first computer is operated by a child (0039) and the operator of the second computer is a parent/guardian (0039).

As concerns claims 12 and 35, wherein multiple URLs are requested by the first computer, each URL being placed in a queue (inherent for network device/server to have a buffer/memory/queue) awaiting approval (user requests multiple URLs over time).

As concerns claim 13, the method of claim 12, wherein the queue is a limited queue with a maximum predetermined number of URLs allowed in the queue (inherent for buffer/memory to have a storage limit).

As concerns claim 14, the method of claim 12, wherein the queue is an unlimited queue with no limit as to the number of URLs allowed in the queue (when queue has adequate storage space it can accept numerous requests).

As concerns claims 36 and 51, wherein permitting access of the URL request by the first computer if the requested URL is found in the approved table of information comprises: accessing a Web page identified by the requested URL (0010); and routing the Web page to the first computer for browsing (0010).

As concerns claim 17, the method of claim 15, wherein the URL request is logged (figure 4).

As concerns claims 18, 37 and 56, further comprising updating (figure 4) the table of information if the URL request is approved.

Art Unit: 2451

As concerns claims 19 and 38, further comprising updating (figure 4; 288) a table of denied URLs if the URL request is denied.

As concerns claims 20 and 52, further comprising sending a message to the first computer indicating denial of the URL request if the URL request is denied (browser will not display page thus resulting as a “message” request is denied).

As concerns claims 21 and 53, further comprising enabling an operator of a third computer (0027-distributed network would have a third computer) to determine whether to grant access of the requested URL to the first computer when the operator of the second computer is unavailable and the requested URL is not found in the approved table of information, wherein the operator of the first computer comprises a child, the operator of the second computer comprises a parent/guardian and the operator of the third computer comprises one of a trusted friend and family member (0039).

As concerns claim 24, an article comprising: a storage medium having a plurality of machine accessible instructions, wherein when the instructions are executed by a processor, the instructions provide for receiving a URL (universal resource locator) request (abstract lines 6-8) from a first computer (180,202); comparing the URL request with URL entries in an approved table (abstract lines 11-12; 0009) of information; if the requested URL is found in the approved table of information, permitting access of the URL request by the first computer (0010); if the requested URL is not found in the approved table of information, enabling an operator of a second computer (0036-server hardware) to determine whether to grant access of the requested URL to the first computer (0010; 0036, 212,214; 0039).

Art Unit: 2451

Bellinson et al. '621 do not explicitly disclose wherein the operator of the second computer is notified that access to the web page has been granted to the first computer.

Schaefer et al. '252 teach notifying a second computer that access has been granted via a plurality of devices comprising a cell phone (0015, 0016, 0018).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the system of Bellinson et al. '621 with an alert as taught by Schaefer et al. '252, in order to provide a means of monitoring another users activities. Such a modification is a combination of known elements yielding predictable results.

4. Claim 22, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0006621 to Bellinson et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0097452 to Kim et al.

As concerns claim 1, a method for monitoring Internet browsing: receiving a URL (universal resource locator) request (abstract lines 6-8) from a first computer (180,202); comparing the URL request with URL entries in an approved table (abstract lines 11-12; 0009) of information; if the requested URL is found in the approved table of information, permitting access of the URL request by the first computer (0010); if the requested URL is not found in the approved table of information, enabling an operator of a second computer (0036-server hardware) determine whether to grant access of the requested URL to the first computer (0010; 0036, 212,214).

Bellinson et al. '621 do not explicitly disclose the second computer includes a television connected to a home network.

Kim et al. '452 teach a television (300) connected to a home network (figure 1).

Art Unit: 2451

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the system of Bellinson et al. '621 with a television, as taught by Kim et al. '452, in order to utilize conventional home appliances thus saving the user space and money. Such a modification is a combination of known elements yielding predictable results.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claim 49 and 50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Claims 3-11, 26-34, 39-42, 44 and 45 are allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed September 2, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues Schaefer et al. do not teach the use of web pages or URL's. Bellinson et al. disclose web pages and URL's and the teaching reference of Schaefer provides for an alert for monitoring a particular users activities.

As concerns claims 47 and 55, the applicant argues Bellinson et al. nor Schaeffer et al. teach the operator views at least a portion of a web page prior to granting or denying access. This limitation is recited in the claim as a conditional limitation since it is preceded by the term "if", thus if the condition is not satisfied this limitation need not be addressed.

As concerns claim 22, the claims have been given the broadest reasonable interpretation and the prior art teaches the limitation, even with the inclusion of the term "dynamically". The

Art Unit: 2451

applicant has not indicated where support for this term is found in the original disclosure and how such a term would now render the claim distinguishable from the prior art.

### ***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John B. Walsh whose telephone number is 571-272-7063. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from



Art Unit: 2451

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John B. Walsh/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2451